## REMARKS

The Invention:

The present invention provides a unitary body, *i.e.*, one-piece, air-core coil mounting bracket having a U-shaped body and at least one retaining form. The retaining form is structured to be coupled to a fastener on a circuit breaker load conductor. The retaining form is located below the U-shaped body. That is, the U-shaped body has a longitudinal axis and the retaining form is located substantially below the longitudinal axis.

Thus, when the mounting bracket is attached to a fastener coupling the load conductor to the circuit breaker housing, and an air-core coil is disposed within the U-shaped body, the air-core coil will be disposed, generally, above the fastener heads. Because the fastener heads are not within the perimeter of the toroidal current sensor, the air-core coil will be located outside of the toroidal current sensor perimeter. Accordingly, because the air-core coil is not disposed within the perimeter of the toroidal current sensor, the toroidal current sensor can have an inner radius and, therefore the outer radius as well, that is closer to the load conductor than prior art toroidal current sensors. Because the volume occupied by the toroidal current sensor is smaller, the circuit breaker may be made smaller too.

An added advantage of the unitary body mounting bracket is that, it is less expensive to manufacture and is easier to install than the prior art two-piece mounting bracket.

Status of the Claims

Claims 9-20 remain pending in this application.

Claims 9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art.

Claims 10 and 12-20 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claims 9 and 10; Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 9 and 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art. Specifically, the Examiner refers to

the Background Information and Figure 1. As noted in the Background Information, the prior art air-core coil mounting bracket included a metal portion and an insulated portion. The metal portion was an elongated body that attached to the load conductor fastener. That is, the metal portion was a generally flat, elongated body having a hole therethrough at one end and the insulated portion attached to the other end. The fastener coupled to the conductor was passed through the opening and drawn tight against the conductor, thereby securing the mounting bracket to the conductor. In this configuration, the mounting bracket was either below the fastener (the metal portion) or adjacent to the fastener (the insulated portion). The mounting bracket was not disposed "over" the fastener. Additionally, because the metal portion was generally flat with an opening and because no part of the metal portion extended above the fastener head, the metal portion did not have an arcuate retaining form with a bottom portion lip structured to fit under the fastener head. That is, as described in the specification, the retaining form is dimensioned to fit over the fastener head with only a small portion, a lip, extending under the fastener head. This is structurally distinguishable from the prior art where the flat, metal portion is disposed substantially under the fastener head.

Accordingly, Applicants disagree with the Examiner's assertion that the Background Information describes a mounting bracket having a retaining form structured to fit "over" a fastener head. Applicants further disagree with the Examiner's description that the metal portion of the mounting bracket is equivalent to an arc-shaped retaining form with a retaining lip.

Independent claim 9 recites a circuit breaker that includes a mounting bracket structured to fit over a fastener head. As the disclosed prior art does not include a circuit breaker that includes a mounting bracket structured to fit over a fastener head, the disclosed prior art should not be used as a basis for a rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 11, which depends from claim 9, further recites that the retaining form is an arc having a bottom portion with a lip, with the lip being structured to fit under the head of a fastener. As the disclosed prior art does not include a retaining form with an arc having a bottom portion with a lip, with the lip being structured to fit

under the head of a fastener, the disclosed prior art should not be used as a basis for a rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

## CONCLUSION

Based on the remarks set forth above, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claims 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), should be withdrawn. Applicants respectfully submit that the application is now in proper form for issuance of a Notice of Allowance and such action is requested at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

David C. Jenkins
Registration No. 42,691
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC
600 Grant Street, 44th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Attorney for Applicants

(412) 566-1253